COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. VI. No. 2.] LONDON, SATURDAY, JULY 14, 1804. PRICE 1OD

" *By the Lard, now, and I sheant get out! I shall stay where I am, Mister* DEPUTY BULL; " *for if you don't know when you have got a good sharvent, I know when I've got a good* " *place.*——LOONY MACTOULTER, in the Wags of Windsor.

MR. PITT.

SIR,—As it appears from the speech which Mr. Pitt made in the House of Commons on the 18th of last month, and from the language used by his partisans and pamphleteers, that he means to impute inconsistency to those who some time ago expressed their eager wishes to see him return to power, and who now that he has returned are in opposition to his ministry, I think it may be of importance to bestow upon this point a little examination.——I confess for one, that I never did participate in the wishes to which I allude. Not entertaining such an opinion of Mr. Pitt as could authorize the use of any, the simplest compliment, I certainly could not agree in the propriety of using one of the very highest degree. And, Sir, it has always appeared to me, that the compliment here referred to would have sounded better from the mouth of Mr. Canning, or Mr. S. Bourne, or Mr. C. Long, or other such adherents. But, laying this point aside, let us come to the use which Mr. Pitt and his partisans are endeavouring to make of these (which I should call) *lapsus linguæ.*——I would premise, that Mr. P. and myself are not agreed on the very expressions of the compliment. For he asserts, that it was said, that he, he alone, and he only, could save the state. This interpretation I deny. But allowing that this was the sense of the words used, I would observe: 1. That the same words have different forces and almost different meanings according to the purposes for which they are used; that you must not always understand language precisely as you find it explained in a dictionary, but as it is used in common life for the purpose of expressing the idea which is wished to be expressed; that though, in interpreting a statute, or a piece of argument, every word is to be taken in its strictest and literal sense, yet that greater latitude is allowed to other compositions; such, as in the familiar intercourse by letter, in conversation, &c. but most of all is latitude allowed in congratulatory or *complimentary* addresses, such as those, Mr. Pitt's comment on which has now induced me to take up the pen.——If Mr. Pitt was ever in love with a lady, he may have used the expressions of " angel," or " divine creature," to the object of his love: yet, I suspect. he would have been much surprised as well as alarmed at an attempt to bind him down to a line of conduct and action corresponding with the literal meaning of his complimentary expressions.——2. I would suggest to Mr. Pitt, that if compliments were to be interpreted literally by any one, certainly they ought not to be so interpreted by the person to whom they are addressed, and that, if that person has forfeited the attention which suggested the compliment by a fault of his own, it is foolish to remind the other of it; if by the fault of the other, at best it is ungenerous. A new mistress might say, I will not believe your expressions of compliment; they are false, and will make no impression; but, if the old one, who experienced this inconstancy were to reproach her lover with his former sighs and vows, this would be but a bad way to reclaim him; and if this inconstancy arose from good cause of anger proved on her part, from the discovery of infidelity or of profligacy, to recall to him the expressions of his former love would be the excess of folly and presumption—it might convict him of blindness and infatuation, but it would, at the same time, convict her of such excessive vice, that even blindness and infatuation were not proof against it.——3. I would remind Mr. Pitt, that it is very possible to change an opinion, without being fairly chargeable with inconsistency. Where is the man who will say, that an opinion may not be honestly and conscientiously changed? Where is the man who thought well of Mr. Pitt, not only when these compliments were uttered, but six months ago only, who will not admit this? Least of all, I presume, will Mr. Pitt deny this position, seeing his own conduct on the subject of Parliamentary Reform, the Catholic Question, &c. &c. But if he does not admit it, I think, considering their present near connexion he will soon be argued into it by that able arguer and discreet actor my Lord Castlereagh.——4. But supposing the very reverse of the propositions main-

tained under these three heads to be the fact; suppose it be right to interpret compliments strictly; suppose the person to whom they are addressed with all becoming modesy is the fittest person to put that strict interpretation upon them, and to apply them to himself; and suppose, lastly, that an opinion in favour of Mr. Pitt can never be honestly changed; admitting all this, I still would hint to Mr. Pitt not to recall to the world these expressions of compliment; which, however fair on the outside seem to me to contain within the most cutting sarcasm. I think this will appear upon a review of the circumstances in which they were used. They were these: the affairs of the country were under the direction of a ministry, whose every act appeared to some persons acts of folly, weakness, and imbecility. Such were the persons who used the expressions of compliment. The person of whom it was used, had, up to that time, not only abstained from expressing any disapprobation of the measures of that ministry, but had actually given them his unqualified and entire approbation. I suppose no one will deny, that Lords Grenville and Temple, and Mr. Grenville were sincere in their opposition to the measures of that ministry. It is not to be supposed, that persons would expose themselves to all the obloquy, and abuse, and unpopularity to which the opposers of the peace and the peacemakers were exposed, without being sincere at least, especially as Lord Melville (then Mr. Dundas's) ingenious surmise of its being a "conspiracy for place" is now proved to have been erroneous. [I should like to ask any impartial man now, which seems the most zealous conspirator for place, Lord Grenville or Lord Melville?] If they were sincere then in opposing the peace, they were likewise sincere in opposing the views of policy, which made Mr. Pitt support and approve it. Under these circumstances it was the compliments were paid. Does it not follow then, of course, from the preceding data, that if the persons paying these compliments wished to see Mr. Pitt return to power, they wished to see him acting upon views of policy which they thought would be advantageous to the country, and not those which they thought ruinous upon their views and not his own? Or in other words, does it not appear evident, that they thought that Mr. Pitt if in office, and if responsible, would be unwilling and ashamed to perform such acts as these, which out of office and irresponsible he was not ashamed to support with all his eloquence and his most [illegible]? Does it not appear, that though, if the compliments are to be taken literally, they thought him the most able men in the country; yet that it, of necessity, follows, that they thought him as insincere in his heart as exalted in his views; as full of duplicity as of ability.—— Leaving him to settle these questions, and only assuring him, that in my opinion he deserves all the bad which may be said or thought of him hereafter, without any of the good that has been said heretofore.—— I remain, &c. &c.—ANNIBAL.

PUBLIC PAPERS.

Correspondence between MR. FRERE, *English Minister to the Court of Spain, and the* PRINCE OF PEACE, *Prime Minister of his Most Catholic Majesty: preceded by the article in the French paper, the Moniteur, by which the correspondence was occasioned.*

Moniteur, No. 184.—"Madrid, March 10, 1804.—Mr. Frere, the English minister at this place, seems to be much affected by the news which have arrived from Paris. A few days before he forgot himself so far as to assert, in a conversation which he had with the Prince of Peace, that assassination and murder are lawful, in the present state of things, to save England from the extraordinary situation in which it is placed. The Prince of Peace bluntly replied, "But, Sir, "should France adopt the same principle, nations would carry on war by "the medium of assassins, instead of "fighting with fleets and armies. I cannot help declaring that this morality "would excite horror in the mind of his "Catholic Majesty. For my part I can "only tell you, that the example of all "ages prove that crimes, in the end, always fall on the heads of those who order, or are the instruments of them.""

——Then comes the following note by the Editor of the Moniteur.—"The observation of the Prince of Peace has been verified; and at the moment when England was employing the Count d'Artois as an assassin, one of the individuals of his family perished, as an atonement for the crime, under the sword of justice. Infamous ci-devant Bishop of Arras, such is the result of your counsels!"

Madrid, April 7, 1804.—SIR, Your Excellency has undoubtedly read the conversation ascribed to us by the French Official Gazetteer, concerning the late events in Paris. As I flatter myself that my colleagues, and the enlightened persons of the Court, will not be apt to credit stories so ridiculous and so diametrically opposite to the princi-

ples which they know me to profess, I might perhaps have dispensed with noticing a calumny which must reflect upon its authors; and should merely have invited Y. E. to estimate the accuracy of other accounts, proceeding from the same source, by this of which you are at once the judge, and witness. And yet, as it appears that the writer of that article presumes to ground his statement on the testimony of Y. E. it appears to me that I should, in some manner, be wanting to my own justification, and to the representation with which I am entrusted, were I to neglect appealing to that very testimony myself. Besides, the official character of that accusation seems to demand an equally formal and authentic contradiction. These considerations induce me to apply to Y. E. and to request that you will declare whether any such conversation did really pass between us, in which I asserted the principle imputed to me by the Official Gazetteer, and above all, as maintained by him, before the Paris news arrived; in short, whether Y. E. acknowledges the answer ascribed to you, and which concludes by a very intelligible threat of assassination.——(Signed) J. H. FRERE.

Madrid, April 8, 1804.—I have actually seen, that in the Madrid article, inserted in No. 184 of the Gazette, an account is given of a conversation between us, and I was waiting, Sir, for your application to remove, by my answer, the unfavourable opinions you might have formed.—But, as in this kind of business the degree of probability entirely depends upon opinion, and our conferences have taken place without either witnesses or hearers, and as it is impossible, therefore, that they should have been transmitted to the Gazetteer with truth or accuracy, I deem the justification you require from me perfectly useless, since it will be indifferent to the Editor of the Gazetteer whether he publish a contrary statement tomorrow, the value set upon those accounts being relative to the truth they contain. Such has been my opinion when I have seen my character blackened in still darker colours; and he, who should endeavour to restrain the actions of men, whom fortune has placed out of his power, would obtain no other end than that of giving himself constant uneasiness.——(Signed) THE PRINCE OF PEACE.

Madrid, April 10, 1804.——SIR, I have he honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Excellency's note, and you will see, by the date of this, that I have well reflected before I determined to renew so unpleasant a subject; but, in truth, the longer I weigh the expressions of your Excellency's note, the less I find that they answer the purpose for which it was dictated, namely, to remove the unfavourable opinions I might have formed. Y. E. does me the honour to observe, that you expected me to take such a step; it was not, therefore, quite superfluous in itself. And indeed, since I was to make application to Y. E. I do not see how it was possible for me to prefer a demand more moderate, or how I could now desist from it, without obtaining, some way or other, a satisfactory answer. I am fully aware how delicate and difficult the present circumstances are; but, if Y. E. did not think it proper directly to oppose the official Gazetteer's assertions, it would, at least, have been possible, by stripping his statement of all authority, to reduce it to that vague and conjectural character which you yourself have ascribed to it; for this purpose nothing more was required than that Y. E. should assure me you never had divulged any particulars of our conversation, since it is evident that the Moniteur did not mean to cite furtive and clandestine witnesses, but the very person of your Excellency. Y. E. might likewise have given a very plain and very natural testimony in my favour, namely, that the only time I spoke with you upon the subject, I expressed an opinion precisely the reverse of that which the Gazetteer pretended to cite.—(Signed) J. H. FRERE.

Aranjucz, April 13, 1804.——The Editor of the French Gazette supposing, in his No. 184, that a conversation had taken place between you, Sir, and me, has been wanting in the consideration due to my character, by believing me capable of entering upon subjects unworthy of the greatness of soul which adorns me. I do not complain of his offence, and you cannot calm the perturbation of your mind at being implicated in it. How shall I be able to persuade you? I have nothing to add to the reflections contained in my preceding note; may this answer to yours of the 10th prove more satisfactory, and let vague opinions circulate in arbitrary prints.—(Signed)—THE PRINCE OF PEACE.

Madrid, April 17, 1804.——SIR, It had appeared to me that my personal honour, as well as my Sovereign's, in fine, that the value I ought to set upon the good opinion of the Spanish nation, equally impelled me to take the step I have towards your Excellency; and though that greatness of soul Y. E. had so just a title to claim, had lessened the importance of these considerations in your eyes, I should still have flattered myself, that you would shew some indulgence

for the weakness of those, who, on being conscious of those distinguished qualities which raise people above calumny, think that there are instances in which a man, without being wanting to his own dignity, is called upon to shew some respect for public opinion. But, if our notions upon the subject be greatly different, the situation we are in is no less so. On my part I am charged with having maintained an atrocious principle; while they put in the mouth of Y. E. sentiments worthy of your character, and such as all who are not strangers to your loyalty must know that you yourself could have wished to have had ascribed to you, had I been capable of holding the language attributed to me. I cannot, therefore, conceal that in the denial of Y. E. to disavow that conversation, I look in vain for that greatness of soul which you invite me to imitate, when silence, on our part, costs you nothing but the sacrifice of my reputation, inasmuch, at least, as it depends upon your suffrage. Seeing myself deprived of this advantage, there still remains for me the satisfaction to think that I can desist from farther importuning Y. E. upon the subject, and that I am able to await, without that perturbation of mind you ascribe to me, the decision of the public, the opinion of my colleagues, and that of the enlightened persons in this court. They have hitherto been pretty decidedly in my favour, and I flatter myself they will prove sufficient to protect me, not only against the aspersions of the Gazetteer, but likewise against the conjectures which may be built upon the silence of Y. E.—(Signed)—J. H. Frere.

Madrid, April 19, 1804 ——Sir, I cannot avoid returning an answer to your note of the 17th inst. as, although its contents do not vary from the former one concerning the opinions entertained in France upon your character, and mine, I see that you touch other points of greater importance, such as the dignity of your Sovereign, and the public opinion. This question is too serious, and ought not, therefore, to be blended with private interests. I will never believe that the King of England gives his ministers directions derogatory from his majesty and dignity: I respect his high rank as I should, and will not consent, Sir, to your making a court business of what is merely personal. You know, Sir, that whenever you have called to converse with me, I have answered, that political affairs were not within my province, and that the King, my Master, had his Secretary of State, through whose medium the demands of foreign courts were to be transmitted to him. To the other Ambassadors and Ministers I made the same observation; so that I have received their visits as mere acts of goodness and civility from them. Under such circumstances, therefore, causes ought not to be confounded with subsequent events, nor ought what depends upon the private conduct of subjects to be imputed to edicts of the government. My sincerity has more than once prompted me to caution you, Sir, that some individuals about you could do you neither honour nor credit, since their reputation being blasted in other courts, no great opinion could be entertained of their morals in this. And do you know, Sir, whether or not these people may be the authors of the story published by the Paris Gazetteer? I have likewise mentioned several other things to you; and it was, perhaps, owing to my advices that you avoided their consequences, as, for instance, General Bournonville's affair, when you wanted to make yourself master of his papers. Let your Excellency call to mind my former conduct, and entertain a proper regard for the sincerity you have experienced from your affectionate servant.—(Signed)—The Prince of Peace.

If you chuse, Sir, I will give an account of what has taken place to the King, my Master, that it may be forwarded to the minister of H. B. M. through the channel of his Ambassador in London; and your Excellency may, from the moderation and terms of my note, form an idea of the high respect I bear H. B. M. since, if it were not for this just consideration, I should not have answered your last note.

Madrid, April 20, 1804.——I yesterday received the note of Y. E. which I have read with all the attention it merits. There is a very plain consideration which directly occurs to one's mind, namely, that Y. E. might have spared yourself the unpleasant task of continuing a painful correspondence. Y. E. does me the honour to tell me, that, being no Minister, your correspondence cannot be drawn to any political consequence; and yet you propose to transmit it to the Minister of his Catholic Majesty in London, for the purpose of shewing your respect for his Britannic Majesty.—Y. E. adds, that without such motive you would not have thought yourself bound to answer my note. Upon this I must observe, that expressions of personal respect from a private individual to a Sovereign, do not appear to me to be customary; and that, viewing the note of Y. E. in this light, I would not undertake to lay it officially before his Majesty. And yet, as it contains certain allusions to my conduct, I thought it my duty to transmit it to the Secretary of State of his Britannic Majesty, with proper explana-

tions. If I return no direct answer to Y. E. concerning those allusions, it is because I think them foreign to the subject upon which we began to correspond, and absolutely without an object, since Y. E. has declared that you would not be looked upon as a Minister. Moreover, nobody being present when the conversation in question took place, the discussion would prove endless, and be of no other use than that of presenting to the public the indecent spectacle of two persons, each of whom has some claim to their respect, mutually contradicting one another in the face of the whole world.—(Signed)—J. H FRERE.

Madrid, April 23, 1804.——I persuade myself that Y. E. will not be surprised at the course I take, and which is, in my opinion, the only rational one. Since I desisted in my note of the 17th, from the demand of a disavowal, our correspondence could no longer have any object. From the moment that Y. E. declared that you would not be considered a minister, I became sensible that farther discussions would only produce a personal altercation. This was the motive why I avoided discussing various points contained in the last note of Y. E. and it is also the motive which influences me at present. When Y. E. has taken into consideration the situation you place me in, by stripping me, as well as yourself, of our ministerial characters, I am convinced you will not ascribe to a want of regard, that which is, in reality, the result of the most serious reflection.—(Signed)—J. H. FRERE.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

BANK DOLLARS AND TOKENS.——The bill for inflicting punishment on those who may counterfeit or utter the Bank dollars, on which bill some pertinent remarks were made by a correspondent in the preceding sheet, is now, perhaps, become a law; and, indeed, as was before observed, if unhappily we are driven to the absolute necessity of adopting a currency of this sort, something must be done to prevent its being counterfeited, or else that which is already greatly injurious to the public would be much more injurious. The bill provides for the punishment of those who shall counterfeit this currency: the kind and degree of the punishment are of little consequence: the principle is all. The bill, when passed, will have given the sanction of the Parliament to a measure which transfers to the banks of England and Ireland a right hitherto exercised solely by the King, *the right of coining money*, or, at least, it will admit those bodies, composed of individuals utterly unknown to the constitution of this monarchy, to a co-equality in the exercise of that ancient, high, and important right.——Perceiving the force of this objection to the whole of the transaction, it was said by Mr. Pitt, in the debate of the 2d instant, that the Bank dollars were not to be regarded as the current coin of the country. He "begged "the House clearly to bear in mind, that "there never was the smallest idea of these "dollars being viewed as the current coin "of the country. They were designed "only to answer the purpose of small paper "money, and differed so far only as in the "one case the pledge was a small bit of sil-"ver, and, in the other, a little note of pa-"per." "In fact," says he, "if I may use "the expression, they are silver bank notes; "and, having been found necessary in the "particular emergency of the country, the "House is called upon to prevent the ex-"pedient from becoming dangerous." But, then, if there never was the smallest idea of making these dollars the current coin of the country, how comes the head of his Majesty to be imprinted upon them? "Whose image "and superscription is this?" It is the *King's*. And will not the dollars, therefore, be regarded as the *King's coin?*—On the *reverse*, indeed, poor Britannia is accompanied by a bee-hive instead of a man of war, and (oh! "to what vile uses may we come Ho-"ratio!") by the arms and name of the Bank. Nevertheless, it must have been known to those who were the inventors of this scheme as well as to those by whom it is now prosecuted, that the impression of the King's head would inevitably convey the idea of current coin, and that the dollars thus impressed would be regarded as such by nine-tenths of the people. Nay, can there, from the title and preamble of the bill itself, remain, in the mind of any man, much doubt that the ministry themselves intended that that the dollars should pass for coin? It is called "a bill to prevent the counterfeit-"ing of silver *coin* issued by the governor "and company of the Bank of England, "called dollars, and silver *coin* which may "be issued by the governor and company of "the Bank of Ireland, called tokens." In the preamble it is stated, that the Bank has caused a large quantity of silver dollars to be *coined* or stamped; and the word stamped is inserted only for the purpose of preventing counterfeiters from availing themselves of any objection that might be raised upon the circumstance of the dollars not having been made by the same process as is pursued at the mint. That the minister, should, therefore, stand up in his place in the House and declare that there never was the *smallest idea* of these dollars being received as th[e]

current coin of the country, cannot but be matter of astonishment.——The truth is, that, from every thing that passed during the debate alluded to, no opposition, objection, or observation, seems to have been expected by the ministry. Mr. Sturges, who is one of the new Secretaries of the Treasury, and who moved the House upon the subject, seemed not to have been armed with even the common place ministerial remarks upon the respectability and integrity of that patriotic and loyal body, the directors of the Bank; much less was he prepared with any argument in reply to those who objected to the bill as sanctioning an invasion of the royal rights of his Majesty. Mr. Pitt was evidently aware of no objection to the measure, and had only just time to perceive, that he must rub off the word *coin*, or his opponents would compel him to proclaim a *depreciation* of his bank paper. To the objection of stamping the King's head upon the dollars he could find no answer; and, indeed, it was impossible to find a satisfactory one; for, if the dollars were regarded by their inventors as nothing more than "*silver* bank notes," how came they to think of imprinting on them the title and image of the Sovereign, seeing that this never had been, and is not now, done with respect to the *paper* bank notes? In his hurry, however, Mr. Pitt quite overlooked a circumstance that stood in great need of clear explanation before he sat down as if contented with having warded off the fatal charge of depreciation. This same bill, which, in its preamble, declares that the dollar issued by the Bank of England is to pass for 5s. declares that the dollar issued by the Bank of Ireland is to pass for 6s. that is, for 5s. 6d. English money, that is to say, for ten per centum more than the dollar of the Bank of England. It will hardly be pretended, that the word *token* instead of dollar gives any additional value to the piece; and, indeed, it would be perfectly ridiculous to ascribe this difference in the nominal value of pieces of metal of the same nature and weight to any other cause than that of the difference in the value of the paper in company of which they circulate in the two countries respectively. This act of parliament does, then, establish, beyond all dispute, the fact of depreciation, as far as relates to the paper money of Ireland, without at all impairing the arguments that have been urged in support of a real though not a nominal depreciation in the paper money of England; for still they pass in England at 6d., and indeed at more than sixpence sterling above their intrinsic value. The describing of them as "silver *notes*;" as "small bits of silver used in lieu of little "notes of paper" cannot deceive any one who bestows the least reflection upon the subject. This is, in truth, a palpable fallacy; for, they are not "*small* bits of silver," but on the contrary very *large* bits of silver. Had they been no bigger than a six pence, or had they been even bigger than half a crown, but evidently bearing a nominal value beyond their intrinsic value as compared with the paper, then indeed, they might with some degree of plausibility have been regarded as mere notes, though even in that case one might reasonably have wondered that the bank directors, supposing their credit to be still unshaken, should think it necessary to imprint their promises on such expensive materials. But, now that we see the promise to pay 5s. printed on so large a piece of silver, it is impossible to believe that the nominal has, as in the case of paper notes, no reference whatever to the intrinsic value. It was mentioned by Mr. Sturges, as a circumstance in favour of the measure, that "*nobody was compelled* to take these "dollars and tokens *in payment*." That gentleman is not very profound, or he would have perceived that this was a most potent argument against the bill that he was pressing upon the House; for, if the dollars had really been considered as mere notes, why were they not made a legal tender as well as the other notes of the bank? And, ought it not to have been an insurmountable objection to them, that they bore the King's title and image, that they went forth clothed with royal authority, *without being lawful money of the realm?* These are the persons, too, who affect to regard themselves as the supporters of the King's prerogative and dignity! There is room for a bare possibility that they may wish to do it, but assuredly they pursue not the means of effecting that object.——Mr. Dent took occasion to observe, that the issuing of the dollars, by the two banks in question, had been, and would be, productive of great public convenience; and, that previous to their being issued there was hardly any such thing as obtaining the change necessary for the affairs of trade. These observations, the former of which was corroborated by Mr. Pitt, were very true; lamentably true; but they in nowise contributed towards furnishing an answer to the objections that were stated to the measure: they tended to convince no one that the dollars were not too high priced, unless the paper was allowed to be depreciated; and still less were they calculated to remove an objection to the imprinting of the marks of Majesty upon mere notes of the bank, upon money that no man was obliged to take in payment. Mr. Dent's support was built

upon the old plea, *necessity*. Milton has called this "the tyrant's plea." It frequently is so, perhaps. But in this country it is constantly the plea of political blindness, indecision, and procrastination, which, as to the subject before us, created a want of confidence in the government and a consequent growing distrust in the solidity of the bank, which institution is now clearly perceived to have a close connexion with and dependence upon the political power of the state.——This closing remark suggests the propriety of adding here a few observations to those formerly made as to the different stages through which we have passed to this connexion between the government and the bank. When one considers the vast convenience that the bank offers to a minister of this country, whose chief difficulty almost always lies in getting money, it is not at all surprising, that, ever since the establishment of that corporation, it has been an object of desire with the minister of the day. But the Parliament, who seem, till of late years, to have watched with great vigilance over every attempt made by the minister to come at money without their express consent, repealed, in 1793, the act of William and Mary, prohibiting the bank to advance money to government, except in consequence of Parliamentary authority previously obtained. This salutary check being removed, a connexion of a new, and, as it has proved to be, most dangerous kind, was immediately formed between the minister and the bank. It is obvious what a vast accession of power this measure must have given to the minister, who could now defer applying to Parliament to an opportunity when political circumstances facilitated the success of the application; and, it was at all times in his power to hide the expenses of his measures from the eyes of the people, until he had committed the national honour for the discharge of the debts contracted in consequence of those expenses. Of these facilities the minister of that day (and indeed of this day too) did not fail to avail himself. Always short-sighted; always hoping for relief that failed him; always putting off the evil hour; he freely had recourse to the bank, insomuch that it is stated by Mr. Howison (whose excellent "Investigation" contains the substance of much of these observations) that, in the course of three years t most, the bank actually advanced to the government about fifteen millions of money. This connexion has subsisted ever since, and is, of course, becoming every day closer and closer. The solidity of all bank paper must consist in the certainty of obtaining payment in specie at the will of the holder; and, though the specie should be in the coffers of the bank, that circumstance would add nothing to the security of the holder of the paper, unless there was somewhere a power to compel the bank to pay him in specie. When, therefore, the government becomes the banker, or an associate with the banker, all security to the individual is gone. From this cause it is, that no government paper currency was ever long supported; and, in the exact proportion that the government becomes connected with a bank; in the exact proportion that their interests, their credit, and their pecuniary fate became interwoven with one another; in that proportion will their paper money, allowing for the effect of different circumstances of permanency and of habit, become suspected and depreciated; because it is well known that in the first place the government will be continually calling upon the bankers for fresh issues of their paper, and that it has afterwards the power of protecting them from fulfilling their engagements towards the holders of such paper. This has been the progress with us: the minister borrowed from the bank, till the bank could no longer pay in specie, and then a law was obtained from Parliament to shelter the bank against the just demands of its creditors, who when we consider all the difficulties and expenses of seeking redress through courts of justice, may assuredly be said to have no means of redress left; and that, in fact, the paper of the bank of England, and, through its means, all the provincial paper in the country, is become *a legal tender*. Still, however, there wanted one thing to consummate the connexion between the government and the bank; and that was the measure which has led to these observations; a measure which implants upon the precious metal the proof of a degradation of the bank paper, at the same time that it conveys to the minds of even the most uninformed the idea of a perfect community of interests between their Sovereign and that bank.

IRISH SMALL NOTES.——When intelligence was, sometime ago, received from Ireland of the want of small coin as circulating medium, and when the people of Dublin had been informed, that dollars or other *coin* would be procured to supply the wants of the country, it was stated in this work that such promise could never be kept; but that small bank notes must be resorted to; for, that the precious metal could not, for any length of time, be kept in circulation, at a nominal nearly so low as their real value, in company with a paper so degraded as that of Ireland. This prediction, which indeed it required no conjuror to make, is now am-

ply fulfilled. Private notes have been made; but, as it is evident they cannot long stand without some aid from government, a bill is now before Parliament, the object of which is to authorize what are called the "regis- "tered bankers" to issue small promissory notes, which are not to be payable except in notes of the Bank of Ireland. If a bundle of these notes are offered for payment, and *change* is wanted, the person who demands payment of them must tender the change along with them; so that not a single six-pence of silver ever can be extracted through their means from the person by whom they have been issued. These notes are to be stamped, and, of course, they are to pay a stamp duty; and here a provision occurs at which one cannot help smiling; it is forbidden to issue them "by the sheet!" Towards the close of the financial farce in America, notes were paid away by the *quire*, and at last of all, even by the *ream*. How long it will be before the Irish paper will arrive at this point, it would be difficult to say; because the event will, in a great measure, depend upon extraneous circumstances; but, supposing us to continue in our present warlike and political career; supposing the next three years to lead us downward as rapidly as the three last have, there is very little probability that these notes will have much real value at the end of that time.—Why, it may be asked, were not the small bank notes issued in England instead of dollars? And, indeed, if the dollars were to be reckoned as mere notes of the bank; if they were intended to have no more value with the people than if they were paper; if no degree of confidence was expected to be inspired by their intrinsic value; if this were the case, it is quite impossible to give any reason for small paper notes not having been adopted. But, clearly, this was not the case: it was expected and was known, that confidence would be given to their intrinsic worth; that they would obtain circulation in consequence of that worth, which aided by the habitual reverence for the royal title and image, would give a prop to the credit of the bank, which, had the country continued much longer under the difficulty of procuring change for a one pound note, would have sunk so low as to have brought the note to an open discount. The same effect would have been produced by issuing small bank notes, such as those now to be issued in Ireland; and, if the Bank of Ireland possessed the means, we may be certain that they would issue dollars enough to preclude the necessity of notes so small that it is apprehended they may go forth by the sheet. But the bank paper of Ireland is at an open discount: nothing can retrieve it, or palliate its disgrace: sentence of death is passed upon it, and the few six shilling dollars, or tokens, that are to be issued will only serve to eke out, and that too for a very little while, perhaps, its miserable existence.—Those who are so terrified at the prospect of a fall of the bank paper, and who ask "where are we to look for a circulating me- "dium in the room of it" may be referred to the present state of Ireland for a very satisfactory solution of the question. In the North of Ireland there is no paper money in circulation. There, says Mr. Parnell, in his very able publication, which every one should at this time read, "the currency of "specie has been maintained pure and un- "corrupted, whilst, in every other part of "Ireland, the introduction of excessive "quantities of paper has been productive "of the greatest abuses and the most se- "rious consequences." There is no truth more clearly established, than, that if currency be unchecked by law, it will find its proper level. Every country will have as much as it wants of it, and no more. But, as long as a connexion of a pecuniary nature exists between a government and a bank; as long as there is paper forced into circulation; so long the precious metals will continue to fly from it. In proportion as the quantity of paper increases, that of gold and silver diminishes, and *vice versâ*. If, therefore, the paper were all withdrawn, there would be gold and silver to supply its place, and that instantly too: the latter would come forth as rapidly as the former disappeared. Not that it is to be supposed that there are thirty millions of guineas hidden in the country, as Lord Hawkesbury imagined; but, with regard to currency, all the world is but one nation, and whatever part of that nation has the least share of currency, in proportion to the value of its commodities, will be the point towards which currency will flow from every other part, till all have their due quantity.——Having referred to the pamphlet of Mr. Parnell, it is proper here to acknowledge the error which he has noticed in the Register, Vol. V. p. 281, where reference is made to a speech of Sir John Newport, and where, as it now appears, too great a degree of effect in producing the difference of exchange between England and Ireland was ascribed to the remittances to England in interest of loans and in payments to absentees. It was, however, there expressly stated that, "a *consi-* "*derable share*" of the loss arising from the difference of exchange was attributable to the depreciation of the Irish paper. Mr. Parnell maintains, and he clearly establishes

his position, that the *whole* of the loss on account of exchange arises at present from the depreciation of the Irish paper money. Upon this part of his subject he refers to facts which are very curious, and cannot leave a doubt in the mind of any man. Indeed the whole passage is so interesting and valuable that it is impossible to resist the temptation to quote it entire. "One most extraordinary "circumstance has arisen from the peculiar "state of the northern circulation, namely, "an established rate of exchange between "Belfast and Dublin; not merely a rate "which possibly might be the consequence "of dealings upon bills of long credit, or of "partial variations in the extent of their "commercial intercourse, but steadily set-"tled, even as high in some instances as "11½ per cent. This circumstance, toge-"ther with the practice of fixing a paper "price and a cash price on all goods for "sale in the North, amply corroborates "every argument already made use of to "prove the depreciation of paper, and also "the effect of this depreciation upon the "rates of exchange between Dublin and "London. It is easy to estimate some of "the most striking consequences attending "a currency of specie, of paper convertible "into specie, or of paper issued to an excess "not convertible into specie. For instance, "if a landlord in the North, previous to the "restriction of cash payments, let 100 acres "of land for 100 guineas per annum, and if "a landlord in the South did the same at "that period, both of them would have re-"ceived equal benefit, and exactly the same "sum of money, because they both received "their rents in specie, or what was of equal "value, paper convertible into specie. The "state of the case is now materially dif-"ferent; the landlord of the North receives "100 guineas in specie, the landlord of the "South receives 100 guineas in bank notes. "If guineas bear a premium of 10 for every "100, the landlord of the South does not "receive from his 100 acres so much by 10 "guineas, as is received from the 100 acres "in the North.—If both landlords sent "their rents to Dublin, to purchase govern-"ment stock, the landlord receiving specie "for his rents, would be able to buy stock "to the amount of 10 guineas in each 100 "guineas of rent, more than the landlord "could buy with his rents paid in bank pa-"per. As the currency of the North may "therefore be considered as supporting the "former arguments made use of to demon-"strate the degraded state of the paper cur-"rency; so does it also most clearly corro-"borate the position which has been laid "down and proved, that this degradation is "the cause and measure of the rates of ex-"change. For when the exchange from "Dublin on London is 16¼ per cent, that of "Belfast on London has been 5¼, and of "Belfast on Dublin 11½ per cent. These "were the exact rates in December, 1803, "as will appear by the following state-"ment; and they are the usual rates now "existing:

"June 1, 1803.	Belfast on	London	8¼ to 9
		Dublin	5¾
"July 1,		London	8¼
		Dublin	6
"Aug. 1,		London	8¼
		Dublin	7
"Sep. 1,		London	7
		Dublin	11½
"Oct. 1,		London	7¼
		Dublin	8½
"Nov. 1,		London	5½
		Dublin	11¼
"Dec.		London	5¼
		Dublin	11½

"We have therefore direct evidence of the "rates of exchange of Belfast on Dublin, "and on London, and of Dublin on Lon-"don being so adjusted by the operations "of currency, as exactly to maintain in fa-"vour of Belfast the superior value of a "currency of specie, over the degraded cur-"rency of Dublin. In the South of Ire-"land, where bank notes are current, there "exists a very unfavourable rate of ex-"change. In the North of Ireland, where "such notes are not current, this unfavour-"able rate of exchange entirely ceases."

——These simple and obvious facts do, as the author observes, exhibit in one view the whole theory which his work has endeavoured to maintain, because it renders it incontrovertibly true, that the bank notes of Ireland are depreciated, that this depreciation is at this time the sole cause of the unfavourable state of exchange, and that the degree of depreciation is not less than ten per centum, as compared with English guineas within Great Britain and Ireland. To persons who may happen to be strangers to the subject, it will not be unnecessary to observe, that the difference between English and Irish money is 8⅓ per centum, and that, of course, when the exchange between England and Ireland is 8⅓ it is in fact *at par*. But, at this time, and for a considerable time back, the exchange between London and Dublin has been above 16 per centum, while, as we have seen above, that between London and Belfast is no more than 5¼; so that, the exchange with London is about 8 per centum *against* Dublin at the same moment that it is about 3 per centum in *favour* of Belfast, making a difference of 11 per

centum, which accordingly we find to be the actual rate of exchange with Belfast against Dublin.——Agreeing with Mr. Parnell as to the fact of depreciation, the reader will also agree with him as to the immediate cause thereof, namely, an excessive issue of bank paper, which excess is clearly traced to the measure of what, in the financial cant of the day, is called "bank restriction," but which ought to be called, *sheltering the bank from the legal and just demands of its creditors*; and this fatal measure, which in its consequences threatens the total and speedy overthrow of our mighty fabric of commercial credit, has already been traced back to the act of 1793, in which the Parliament yielded to the minister's proposition to remove those salutary checks which had been at first devised, and which had so long been preserved for the purpose of preventing a secret connexion and mutual connivance between the government and the bank. But, *necessity*, the standing plea; the "*emergency* of the moment;" the "*existing* circumstances;" the "*imperious necessity*" of the case; this is, at last, the ground on which all these measures are justified. Were it worth while the plea might, in almost every instance, be set aside; for, it would be easy to show, that every one of the measures might either have been entirely avoided or rendered much less mischievous. But, admitting the plea; allowing the necessity to exist in a degree sufficient to justify the measures, where shall we find a justification for the system of politics and political economy, the pursuing of which produced that necessity? Yet, it is to this same system that we are still bidden to look as to the rock of our financial salvation! Even now; yea, this very evening (Tuesday), we bear to be reminded, and that too without any mark of indignation, of "the *powerful* and *salutary* operation of the Sinking Fund!" What! the powerful and salutary operation of that system under which we have arrived at our present state! That system which has reduced us to the necessity of bank restriction, and silver notes; that has produced an income tax and has banished the precious metals from the land! Is this the system on the operation of which we can still suffer ourselves to be congratulated? But, it is no matter: the day of indignation will come. This system has, indeed, a *powerful* operation; and in no way does it operate more powerfully than in blinding the eyes and sealing the lips of the people. Few, comparatively speaking, yet see to the bottom of the abyss, and, of those few, scarcely any one will venture openly to declare what he thinks, there being hardly a man of property in the community whose apparent interests do not, either directly or indirectly, induce him, if not to favour, or, at least, connive at the delusion. Thus, it is greatly to be feared, we shall be led along till it will be utterly impossible to escape the political consequences of a financial revolution.

STAMP DUTIES.—The very great addition about to be imposed upon duties of this description has occasioned a good deal of opposition to the bill which is now before the House of Commons making such imposition. That stamp duties should be raised at a time when all other duties and taxes are raised is by no means surprising; and, considered merely as a burden, it appears grossly inconsistent to complain of the augmentation of the duty on stamps, while the income tax is silently submitted to. The opposition above alluded to has, however, chiefly been confined to the augmenting of the duty upon those stamps which relate to law proceedings; and, in the course of the debates upon the subject, it has been clearly shown, that the stamps on such proceedings have already tended to shut the door of justice against a very numerous class of the community. Of course to add to the amount of the stamps is to increase this evil, which is at the same time a very great disgrace to the country.——This subject will in all probability occupy a place in some future sheet of the Register, but it would not be right here to omit stating the substance of an observation made by a young gentleman of the name of Dickenson by way of reply to Mr. Serjeant Best. The latter, during a most able speech, had asserted and had proved, that, in many cases, the stamp duties with the proposed augmentation would amount to a prohibition; and that thus those who could not purchase justice would not obtain it. At this statement Mr. Dickenson expressed his astonishment, and observed, that if the learned Serjeant had taken time to reflect, he would certainly have made no such statement, seeing that there was a very considerable part of the administration of justice in this country which was totally unfettered by stamp duties, namely, all that valuable part which was left in the hands of *the justices of the peace!* As no attempt was made to weaken the force of this observation, such an attempt was, without doubt, regarded as hopeless; and if such was the light in which it was viewed by Mr. Windham, who spoke afterwards on the other side, it would be presumption to make the attempt here. It may not be amiss, however, just to ask Mr. Dickenson what are the papers, used in the

administration of justice by the inferior magistrates, which he could possibly tax, and which are not already taxed?——Mr. Addington, who came forward to take his full share of whatever blame might be attached to the proposition before the House, the proposition having, in substance, originated with himself, acknowledged that there was much weight in the objections which had been urged against particular parts of the measure, by several persons, but especially by Dr. Laurence. He said, that he could, from the beginning, have wished *not* to impose any additional burden upon law proceedings, and that "*necessity* and neces-" sity *alone* induced him to include in his " proposition the stamps relative to such " proceedings." This was the best defence of the measure itself; but, as in other cases of the same kind, who will furnish a defence of those by whom this fatal necessity has been created? What must be that system, what must be that series of measures, which have produced a plea of absolute necessity for the imposition of a duty which is acknowledged to be fairly liable to objections of such a nature? Mr. Pitt, indeed, acknowledged neither the force of the objections nor the extreme necessity of the tax; but none of his arguments showed the objections to be groundless, and as to his not expressly acknowledging the absolute necessity of the tax, he had evident reasons, which could not operate so strongly with his predecessor.

FORMATION OF THE MINISTRY.—Upon this subject there were certain observations made by Mr. Pitt, in his speech of the 18th ultimo, that ought, long ago, to have been noticed in the Register. On the occasion alluded to, Mr. Canning, who, for reasons that it would not, perhaps, be very difficult to explain, chose to make a party matter of the bill for raising a permanent additional military force, brought a reply from Mr. Sheridan, who, in the course of that reply, observed, that the minister would probably take the hint given him in the recent divisions, and, in imitation of the example of his modest predecessor, resign the reins of power into other hands. "Glad of a quarrel" upon this score; rejoicing at an opportunity of giving a personal turn to a debate in which he was evidently appearing to great disadvantage, Mr. Pitt took up the far greater part of the time, occupied by his answer to Mr. Sheridan, with matter having no connexion with the bill before the House, and this he did under the pretext, that the persons opposed to the bill had "made a mea-" sure directed to the public defence a rallying point to display sentiments and *exert efforts dictated by motives wholly different* "*from the merits or demerits of the question.*" So; one of his own party, one of his very dependents, first gives to the discussion a personal turn; first he accuses Mr. Addington of having commenced "a systematic opposition," because he now opposed a measure which was the exactly reverse of one which he himself had proposed to the House; then accuses Mr. Fox and Mr. Windham of making an opposition to the men rather than to the measure, though neither of them had ever expressed their approbation of any such scheme; and, because he is replied to, because the conduct of Mr. Addington is compared to Mr. Pitt, because, in short, a party speech of Mr. Canning draws forth a party speech from Mr. Sheridan, Mr. Pitt gets up and affects to regard *all* the opposition that has been made to his measure as arising merely from party and personal motives! "Is it," said he, pursuing this notion, "reconcileable with any ideas of constitu-" tional principle and public duty, that, " when a ministry has been changed, their " successors should be obstructed in their " very first operations by any combination " founded upon any circumstances *connected* " *with the recent exercise of his Majesty's* " *prerogative.* The Hon. Gentleman *ad-*" *mits* the real object of the extraordinary " zeal, with which this bill has been con-" tested, and I am sanguine enough to hope, " that this object *being now avowed*, the " bill will make its way through the House " with increased concurrence." This was after the manner of Mr. Pitt, than whom no man is more artful and dextrous in debate. But, how did this representation agree with the fact? for that is certainly a question of some importance to us, the people, at least. The fact was, that the gentleman to whom Mr. Pitt was answering, had made no such admission as that ascribed to him. He had not avowed, either directly or indirectly, that the real object of the opposition to the bill was at all "connected with the recent " exercise of his Majesty's prerogative" in choosing a ministry. This admission and this avowal were, therefore, (to use the most gentle phrase that the case will admit of) assumed by Mr. Pitt, without the least foundation, and for a purpose too obvious and too strongly marked to stand in need of being either pointed out or characterized. Let any one refer to the report of the debate: he will there see, that the question was, by all those who took any considerable share in the discussion of it, discussed entirely upon its own merits, and that, by these persons, not even an allusion had, previous to Mr. Canning's assault, been made to the change in the ministry, or to any one

circumstance at all connected, even in the most distant degree, with the recent exercise of any prerogative of his Majesty. Look at the speeches which Mr. Whitbread, Mr. Windham, and Mr. Fox had made during the debates. Not a word will be found foreign to the legitimate subject of debate: scarcely any passage can be called digression: nothing of a party nature. And, it should be observed, too, that the objections urged by Mr. Windham to the principle of the bill, were objections, which, on several occasions, he had before urged. It will be found, further, that, even out of the House, the observations upon the bill were kept entirely distinct from all matters of a different nature; and that, from first to last, no measure ever was more fairly tried upon its own intrinsic merits or demerits. Nor should it be forgotten, that the persons who were opposed to the measure consisted almost entirely of members of that part of the kingdom where alone the bill was to operate, and that amongst them were about two-thirds of the county members of England. Were all these persons actuated by party motives? Were they all acting upon considerations "*wholly* different from the merits or demerits of the question?" Or, was this imputation a mere device to turn the attention of the House and the public from those merits or demerits?—As to the question of prerogative, the first thing to be asked is, *how long* Mr. Pitt has been the champion of this part of the royal rights, or, indeed, of any of the essential rights of his Majesty? "I "trust," said he, "that the gentlemen on "the other side will not feel themselves "under the necessity of questioning the "King's right to choose his own ministers." He might safely have said this, without any insinuation to the contrary; for no one did question the King's right in this respect; no one attempted to do it; but every one maintained, or, if called upon, would have maintained, the right of Parliament to endeavour, either by direct or indirect measures, to prevail upon his Majesty to change his ministers, which in other words, is to drive ministers from their place. Yet this doctrine Mr. Pitt seemed to deny by describing, as unconstitutional, an attempt to turn him out through the means of a discussion on a bill relating to the defence of the country. Why not through the means of that discussion as well as through the means of any other discussion? When he spoke in the debate of Mr. Fox's motion, of the 23d of April, he did not seem to think that there was any such distinction to be observed. The whole of his speech upon that occasion was evidently designed to drive the ministers from their places. That such was the intention and such the tendency of it will not be denied by the Attorney General at least, who asserted it, and with perfect truth. "If "the question be carried this night," said he, "in favour of the motion, and *especially* "*upon the arguments of the right hon. gent.* "*under the gallery* (Mr. Pitt), there can be "no question of its being followed by the "resignation of his Majesty's ministers. "But I will ask the right hon. gent. if this "is the specie of conduct I am to expect "from his candour? Is it on a motion of "this sort" [on a motion relating to the defence of the country] "that I am to expect "a decision in which is involved the ques-"tion, whether or not the ministers shall "any longer retain the confidence of this "House, or continue to fill their present si-"tuations? Could I have expected it from "him, to choose such a mode or such a "subject, to collect every stray vote and "every stray opinion?" If this charge was not true, let Mr. Pitt demand a recantation from the gentleman by whom it was made, which he can the more conveniently do, because that gentleman now sits upon the same bench with him. It was true, as far as related to the object of the speech; but those who hold that the object was legitimate will, of course, think nothing of the charge. It is a *charge* against him only, who now finds it convenient to adopt the very principle upon which the charge was founded by the Attorney General; and, it is curious enough to see Mr. Pitt supported in urging this charge by the gentleman, who had before so resolutely urged it against himself.— The tenderness shown by Mr. Pitt towards the prerogative of the crown, upon the subject of choosing its ministers, is extremely well delineated by Lord Archibald Hamilton in his "Thoughts on the Formation of the present "Ministry," where he completely exposes and refutes the apology made for Mr. Pitt's conduct upon the ground that it would have been unconstitutional to *force* a ministry upon the King. "If the word *force*," says he, "is to be applied at all, and if a tenderness "towards the crown" (on the part of Parliament) "in this respect be recognized as "sound doctrine, and a salutary principle, "still it is evident, that Mr. Pitt's opposition "to Mr. Addington, and subsequent accep-"tance of power upon the basis of exclu-"sion, cannot be justified upon any such "ground; as it certainly has evinced no "such tenderness. It appears, upon a view "of the whole transaction, that his Majesty "*has been forced*, (in that sense of the word, "which, in behalf of Mr. Pitt, has been "disclaimed) to relinquish Mr. Addington,

though not to accede to the wishes of the House of Commons and the public—that his Majesty has been *forced*, far enough to remove a ministry agreeable to himself, but not enjoying the confidence of the House, though not far enough, to establish such a one as was expected and desired, by the public, at the risk of being not wholly unobjectionable to himself. His Majesty has been *forced*, far enough to disgust himself, but not far enough, to satisfy the country. He has been *forced*, far enough to place Mr. Pitt on the Treasury Bench, but not far enough, to place the government in the hands of a comprehensive and efficient administration. His Majesty has been *forced*, far enough to establish the constitutional precedent, but not far enough, to secure the constitutional benefit in view. Does this conduct exhibit any tenderness to the crown? It is strange and unaccountable, that any man should approve and execute this harsh system of *force*, just to the degree that should *force* himself into office, to the exclusion of those whom, it had been the common object of all parties, as well as of himself, to introduce. Nor is it less strange and unaccountable, that Mr. Pitt should not have foreseen the possibility of some such objection, as that alluded to in these remarks, and been prepared to meet it—or, if not so prepared, that his mind, having been engaged a week or two in this course of lenient opposition to the crown, should not have, at once, resolved, after having incurred the guilt of *force*, not to sacrifice the object. But it is above measure strange and unaccountable, if, from having accurately and scrupulously adjusted the degree of *force* that it was constitutional and decorous to exert, he submitted to incur this guilt, which his friends disclaim for him, without securing the end, which they insist, he had in view, that he should not have resolved, at least, for the sake of character, and to avoid injurious imputations, not to be, at once, and without consultation with any one, the only person of all who had co-operated in this system of *forcing*, to be benefited by its partial success." This was very strange indeed. Yet, it will appear less so, when we look back to the intrigue for place in the spring of 1803, and the subsequent conduct of Mr. Pitt and Lord Melville when the motions for censure were brought forward by Col. Patten and Lord Fitzwilliam. Lord Melville objected to the motion, because it might drive out ministers, "*before there were any persons prepared to take their places.*" Indeed the whole of their conduct, from their resignation in 1801 to the present day, shows that they have had no other object in view than that of coming into power again, unchecked with the association of any men of talents, character and influence, and to retain that power as long as possible. Being out, they could use every possible exertion to drive the late ministers from their places; but, being in, they cry out upon a bear suspicion of a similar attempt against themselves; and, in resolving to cling to their power, in defiance of the wishes and the votes of Parliament, they affect to regard themselves *as the champions of the royal prerogative!* The pretext will avail them little: few persons will be deceived by it: whatever Mr. Pitt may think: whatever his dependents may tell him, he may rest assured, that the resolution which he expressed, that the Parliament "might get "rid of the bill but should not get rid of "him," will, by every just and sensible man in the country, be attributed to selfish ambition, to infatuation, to despair, or to any thing rather than to a tender regard for the prerogative or the feelings of the King. "My right honourable friend (Mr. Pitt,") said Mr. Canning in his speech of December 8, 1802, "is incapable of playing so "dishonourable a game as that attributed to "him" [that of undermining the minister, whom he himself had recommended, in order to thrust him out and take his place] "No man was ever less likely to furnish by "his conduct any grounds for such an imputation. Never did young ambition labour "so much to attach popularity and power "as my right hon. friend has laboured to "*detach them.* He has laboured not for "fame but *for obscurity.*" When, therefore, Mr. Canning heard this very same right hon. friend express the resolution above mentioned; when he saw him flying up from Kent to meet his northern associate, who was approaching the scene of action with a flight as strong and as swift as that of a Turkey Buzzard, which is said to scent a dying horse from New England to Carolina; when he saw him, after assisting at debates and counting in divisions, with the clearly understood object of obtaining for the country a comprehensive and powerful administration, an object loudly proclaimed by Mr. Canning himself; when he saw him immediately after this, eagerly grasping at place in company with six out of ten of those very ministers whom he had openly accused of being unfit to be entrusted with the affairs of the nation, and on whom he had bestowed, even to prodigality, marks of censure and contempt; when Mr. Canning saw this, and when he afterwards heard his right honour-

able friend, at a moment that, from every part of the nation, and from every description of persons, from the court, the parliament, the country, and the city, "get out!" was echoed in his ears, cooly answer, with Loony Mactoulter in the farce: "By the "Lard, now, and I sheant get out! I shall "stay where I am, Mister DEPUTY BULL; "for if you don't know when you have got "a good sharvent, I know when I've got a "good place." When Mr. Canning heard this, with what mortification he must have reflected on the description, which, with sublimity and pathos almost poetic, he had drawn of the disinterested, the modest, the lowly views of his right honourable friend! ——This part of his conduct was, however, much more excusable than some other parts, particularly his reproaching the members of the Grenville family with being now in opposition against him after having, on a former occasion, called for him as the only man capable of retrieving the affairs of the country. I will say nothing of the lowness of this reproach. I will not attempt to describe the state to which it would induce us to suppose the person having recourse to it was sunk; because I hope, and I believe, that it arose from the suggestion of some of those mean persons, with too many of whom, unfortunately, Mr. Pitt is always surrounded. I will confine myself to a few remarks chiefly as to matter of fact. The mark of approbation I believe to have been sincerely bestowed. There is no reason to suppose, that Lord Grenville and his noble relations did not think what they said upon the subject; but, on the other hand, if they thought Mr. Pitt the *only* man capable of retrieving the affairs of the country, will any one say that they meant, or could mean, that Mr. Pitt was able to effect this object *alone*, or, which is the same thing, or rather worse, in company with persons, whom he as well as they had declared to be utterly unfit to be entrusted with power? It is evident they never meant any such thing, but only that, in order to bring about the wished for alteration, it was necessary for him to be again at the head of affairs, he being the person in whom the nation had most confidence. Nor must the *time* when this opinion was expressed be forgotten. It was in the month of November, 1802. And will any one undertake to show, that, since that time, Mr. Pitt's conduct had been such as could furnish them with no reason for changing their opinion? "My noble relation [Lord Temple] ex- "presses his disapprobation of the present "ministry," said Mr. Pitt, "because there "are joined with me in it so many of the "late administration. But, does my noble "relation think, that, on this account I "have forfeited the confidence of him and "his friends? There was a time, *not very dis- "tant*, when, both in this and another place, "a noble lord and his friends were so partial "to me, that they declared, that my ad- "mission to power would remove the dan- "gers of the country. I hope I have not, "by concurring very frequently and acting "very cordially with them and their friends, "forfeited the good opinion they were then "so partial as to express of me. I confess "my surprize too, that after such public "declarations concerning me, they *so soon* "found themselves compelled to withhold "their services from the public, on account "of the exclusion of an hon. gent. (Mr. "Fox), with whom they had, at least till "lately, been so little accustomed to think "or act in unison." To reproach them with thinking and acting in unison with Mr. Fox, at the very moment when his own justification with the public rested entirely upon the truth of the assertion, that he had used his utmost endeavours with the King to admit Mr. Fox into the cabinet, was certainly an instance of boldness that has seldom been surpassed, or even equalled, in an English House of Parliament. But, not to dwell upon this point; I answer, as to the other; no: you did not forfeit their good opinion by concurring very frequently and acting very cordially with them and their friends after the time when they expressed their approbation of you: by no means; but, was there nothing else, Sir, that you did, and that you left undone, after that time and before the time when you reproached them with inconsistency? Had they, think you, completely forgotten the intrigue for place in the months of March and April, 1803; could they have forgotten the subsequent speeches and votes upon Mr. Patten's motion, and upon other occasions? And had they not seen a specimen of your measures in your new character as a projector of means of defence? In short, had they not seen and heard quite enough to justify even a radical change of opinion? You have changed your opinion of persons, with whom you had previously been acquainted all your life, upon much slighter grounds. Lord Hawkesbury, indeed, is now restored to his former place in your estimation, but Mr. Addington seems to be banished for ever. Nor was the time so *little distant* as you would appear to infer. The time when the members of the Grenville family expressed their confidence in you, was in November, 1802, eighteen months before the date of your reproach, a longer time, give me leave to remind you, than elapsed

between the pompous eulogy and recommendation which you passed upon Mr. Addington and his colleagues in March, 1801, and the vote which you gave to keep censure if not impeachment hanging over their heads in June, 1802, embracing a space of less than fifteen months. Unless, therefore, Sir, you can push your system of exclusion so far as to include the right of changing opinions, as well as of being minister, your conduct, if you can justify it, will alone serve as an ample justification for that on account of which you thought proper to reproach your noble relations. But, there is another circumstance that seems to have been entirely overlooked. You not only reproach them with no longer thinking you the *only* man capable of restoring vigour to the proceedings of government, but also with having formed a political connexion with Mr. Fox and his friends, as if the implied inconsistency was palpably augmented by this latter circumstance. Why, Sir, this might have been the reason, at least, it was a very good one, for the change in their opinion as to this point. While there was little or no prospect of a junction with Mr. Fox and his party; while the House of Commons was split into so many divisions; while there was no hope (and in November, 1802, there was not the most distant hope) of a coalition comprising a considerable portion of all the great talents and character in the country, then they might think you the only man to whom the nation could look for assistance. But, after that state of things was completely done away, and that, too, without any co-operation on your part, for you did not begin to co-operate till it was evident to all the world that the object would be finally effected without your aid, if that aid was much longer withheld, many of your friends having already joined the opposition; after this your noble relations, however partial to you, and very partial they certainly were, though not more partial than sincere, might well change their opinion as to your being the only man capable of retrieving the affairs of the nation, there being now *other* men to whom they could look with hope and with confidence.—Mr. Pitt's defence of his six colleagues who made part of the last ministry, remains to be noticed. "With respect," said he in his speech of the 18th of June, "with respect "to any differences of opinion which I may "have had with the late administration, it "will not, I think, be insisted, that they "were of such a nature as to prevent us "from acting together in the most cordial "and satisfactory manner upon affairs in "general. Of these my right hon. and noble friends I uniformly spoke with the "greatest private friendship and private "good opinion. It is still said, however, "that there has not been a sufficient change "in the ministry. But, surely, the right "hon. gentleman below (Mr. Addington) "must be satisfied that the change is sufficient, and that the present is really a "new administration. Two Secretaries of "State have been changed, Lord Melville "had succeeded Lord St. Vincent at the "Admiralty; and though I agree in every "panegyric on Lord St. Vincent as a seaman, I am convinced that Lord Melville "will make a much more useful President "at the Admiralty Board; and though it "may not be fit to speak of myself, it surely will not be considered that it is *no* "*change* that the office of First Lord of the "Treasury, reckoned that which has a "leading influence in the executive government, is now *held by me*. Few will doubt "that *a very real change* has taken place." As Mr. Canning was present at this display of his right hon. friend's modesty and lowliness, one wonders not to have heard of his sinking into the earth, or, at least of some striking proof of his mortification and shame. But, to conclude the remarks of Mr. Pitt. "Much complaint," said he, "has been "made of the *inefficiency* of these ministers; but, will it be asserted, that they "are not equal to the duties of the stations "they fill?" Now, for an answer to this question, I will not refer to the assertions of Mr. Pitt's friends and closest adherents; I will not appeal to the pamphlet in which Mr. Long, speaking from under the dictation of Mr. Pitt, characterized the late ministry and every part of it as destitute of talent and of energy; I will not cite the speeches of Mr. Canning, who, at the close of a description, loading, nay overcharging with marks of contempt those persons with whom he is now sitting on the Treasury Bench, cried out, as it were in a political phrensy: "away the measures and give us "the men!" I will not attempt to make Mr. Pitt answerable for the expressions and opinions of his adherents with regard to the persons with whom he is now associated in power, I will appeal only to himself. Of his "*private* feelings or expressions" we can, of course, know nothing; but of his public declarations, as to the *utter incapacity* of those colleagues whose capacity he now defends, no one, who remembers his memorable speech upon Mr. Fox's motion of the 23d of April, can possibly be ignorant. "Will it," said he on the 18th of June, "be asserted that they are unequal to the "duties of the stations they fill?" Let us,

by referring to the speech of the 23d of April, extract the answer from his own lips. "After 12 months of war, preceded by a "peace which, by the confession of ministers themselves, was a mere notice of "that war, and a war in which they themselves have been exhausted in their skill; "and yet, in the course of the whole 12 "months, they have brought forward nothing in which there has not been a variety of *contradictions in the plans, repugnancies in the measures*, and *imbecility* in "the execution. Nothing in which every "step has not been marked by unnecessary "delay; and at last the measure adopted "amounting to a retraction of the principle upon which it was founded. . . Is it "upon the wisdom, the vigilance, the energy "of these ministers that we are to rely, when "we have seen that no one measure for "the public service can they be truly said "to have originated, while several they "have retarded and enfeebled. . . . . "It is true that ministers, on this, as on "former occasions, have given us a pompous enumeration of the force of the "country" [enumerations always made by "Lord Castlereagh]. "That spirit and "exertion, however, belong to the country, and are *not* to be ascribed to the "direction or the energy of the government. Indeed, if there be any men in "this country who ought, upon this score, "to separate national pride *from any feeling "of personal merit*, it is *the present ministers*, "who have had so little share in the national energy. No one good measure "can they claim *as their own*; no one measure have they *improved or perfected*; very "many they have *weakened* by their delays, and destroyed by their *incongruities*. "Whatever, then, the spirit and zeal of a "free and brave people may have been, "ought fairly to be separated from the "*tardiness*, *languor*, and *imbecility* of ministers in *every thing* of which they have "assumed the direction." There were *ten* of these tardy, languid, inconsistent, imbecile gentlemen, *six* of whom are now in the cabinet with Mr. Pitt, and, it is with respect to these very persons that he now asks, who "will say that they are not equal "to the duties of the stations they fill!" To comment on such palpable tergiversation would be a waste of the small portion of room I have left; but I cannot refrain from asking, as to the "very obvious "*change*," where we are to look for any marks of it? "It surely," says Mr. Pitt, "will not be considered as *no change* that "the office, lately held by the right hon. "gent. is now held *by me*. Few will doubt, "that a *very real change* has taken place "here." And still fewer will have any doubt as to the feelings which language like this must have excited in the House of Commons. But, as to *measures*, what change can we discern? Mr. A. had given notice of his intention to augment the stamp duty to the amount of 800,000 l. Mr. Pitt contents himself with an estimate of 750,000 l. Mr. Pitt is to have *three* lotteries in the year: Mr. A. would probably have had only *two*. Mr. A authorised the bank by an order of council to send forth dollars with the King's head on them: Mr. Pitt sanctions the measure by a law. Under Mr. A. small promissory notes were issued in Ireland instead of silver: Mr. Pitt extends and legalises such issues. Where, in all this, do we discern any effect of that *change*, which we are taught to regard as so important and striking? Had we seen public credit revive, indeed; had guineas returned to circulation; then we could have borne, with some degree of patience, to be reminded of the change. In the affair of the loyalty loan, a change has really taken place. Mr. A. had determined to proceed agreeably to the decision of the law-officers of the crown; whereas Mr. Pitt has determined to pass an act directly contrary to that opinion; which act is to be brought into Parliament by those very identical law-officers! There is one other measure in which the change is visible, and that is the military project bill; and this measure received the marked reprobation of a *great majority* of the members of Parliament of the country in which it was to operate. A project which, in every part of the country, has been received with disgust; a project containing much more of the vexatious, inefficient, and ludicrous than any thing proposed by the ministers whom the projector characterised by almost every phrase expressive of ignorance and imbecility.

*** Several communications having, during the last week, been made to the Editor, upon the subject of the complaints of the JAMAICA PLANTERS, he thinks it right to notify, that some of them will be published in the next sheet of the Register; and that particular attention will be paid to *a correspondence with the Treasury*, which one gentleman has had the goodness to communicate.

Printed by Cox and Baylis, No 75, Great Queen Street, and published by R. Bagshaw, Bow Street, Covent Garden, where former Numbers may be had; sold also by J. Budd, Crown and Mitre, Pall-Mall.